

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

Writ Petition No. 19927 of 2000

Dated: 21.03.2007

Between:

Dune Janiki Ramaiah and another.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

The A.P. Transmission Corpn. Ltd., rep. by its
Chairman and Managing Director,
Vidyuthsoudha, Somajiguda, Hyderabad and another.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

-
Writ Petition No. 19927 of 2000

Order:

Questioning the impugned orders, dated 21.09.1998, issued by the respondents-APEPDCL, rejecting the cases of the petitioners for absorption/appointment in the regular vacancies on the ground that 50% of vacancies earmarked under B.P. Ms. No. 36, dated 18.05.1997, were already filled up, the petitioners filed the present writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-APEPDCL.

The case of the petitioners is that they worked as casual labour in the respondents-APEPDCL for number of man-days, but the respondents-APEPDCL, instead of considering their cases for absorption as Casual Lineman, issued the impugned orders, dated 21.09.1998, rejecting their cases on the ground that 50% of vacancies earmarked under B.P. Ms. No.36, dated 18.05.1997 were already filled up. Whereas, it is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the respondents-APEPDCL issued notification on 31.08.2000 for filling up left over vacancies existing as on 18.05.1997 in the categories of Sub-Engineer and Lower Division Clerks, and though the petitioners are entitled for consideration to the said posts, the respondents-APEPDCL have not considered their cases for the said posts. There is inconsistency in the pleadings and in the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioners. The affidavit filed by the petitioners does not disclose whether they made any applications

pursuant to the said notification or not. It also does not disclose as to how many number of man-days they worked as casual labours in the respondents-APEPDCL and whether they are eligible for absorption in the said posts or not. In the absence of any such particulars, no relief can be granted to the petitioners.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and the same is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

N.V. RAMANA, J.

Date: 21.03.2007

Nsr